REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 24-27 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested. Claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 16, and 20-22 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Item 3: Allowable Subject Matter

In item 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates "Claim 8 appears to be allowable over the prior art of record, subject to a final search." (Action at page 7). Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter

Item 2: Rejection of claims 4, 6, 10, 14, 16, and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In item 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects independent claims 4, 10, 14, and 20 (and respective dependent claims 6, 16, and 21-22) under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Materna et al. (U.S.P. 4,714,995). The rejection is traversed.

Applicants submit that each of independent claims 4, 10, 14, and 20 recited features that patentably distinguish over the cited art

The Examiner has cited long passages of Materna in support of his rejections (Action at pages 1-10). However, the Examiner has not indicated which teachings of Materna, within the cited passages, specifically correspond to recited features of the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments herein traversing the rejections fully respond to the Office Action and are based on Applicants' best *arguendo* assumption as to the specific teaching of Materna that the Examiner appears to assert corresponds to respective, recited features of the present invention.

Storing information on a communication method as collaboration information is not taught by Materna

Independent claim 4 recites an apparatus storing "information on a communication method between the information processing means as collaboration information." Independent claims 10, 14, and 20 have a similar recitation.

Applicants submit that Materna does not teach such a storing of "information on a communication method between the information processing means as collaboration information."

6

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates this feature is taught by Materna citing the integration engine discussion beginning at col. 5, line 27.

Applicants submit that the Examiner is incorrect in his interpretation of Materna. The section cited by the Examiner does not teach shared data is "collaboration information on a communication method," even assuming *arguendo* that Materna's "integration engine 20," cited by the Examiner, teaches a " data perpetuation object apparatus."

Rather, Materna teaches, for example, col. 5, lines 35-44:

> For example, if a CAD system changed a <u>dimension of a part</u>, the same change should be made (i.e., replicated) in the stored value of that part's dimensions in the CAM and MRP data bases. . . . the integration problem is simplified by assigning each common data item an "owner" which is the only local data base permitted to update that data item. The other local data bases which contain the same data item will receive updated data values whenever the "owner" updates that data item, but those other data bases are not permitted to initiate an update. This concept of each data item having a single "owner" is logical in most applications. Returning to the preceding example, it does not make sense for a CAM or MRP system to initiate a change in the dimensions of a part, so it is logical that the CAD system be the exclusive "owner" of a part's <u>dimensional data</u>.

(Emphasis added).

That is, Materna merely teaches that the shared data is for example a "dimension of a part."

Information identification object used in determining information to be stored in each of the storages of the information processors is not taught by Materna

Independent claim 4 recites an apparatus including "information identification object generating means for generating an information identification object that determines information to be stored in a storage apparatus of each information processing means." Independent claims 10, 14, and 20 have a similar recitation.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends this feature is taught by Materna's discussion beginning at col. 10, line 29.

Applicants submit that the Examiner is incorrect in his interpretation of Materna. Even assuming *arguendo* the "dictionary module 64" taught by Materna teaches an information identification object generator, Applicants submit Materna does not teach determining information to be "stored in each of the storages" of the information processors.

Rather, Materna merely teaches, see, for example, FIG. 3, that dictionary information is stored "in any convenient format for access through a data base management system (DBMS) 84." That is, Materna stores the common entry in a single storage, i.e., DBMS 84.

7

Role object as an active role with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission origin, and a role object as a passive role with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission destination is not taught by Materna

Claim 4 recites an apparatus including "role object generating means that generates a role object as an active role with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission origin, and a role object as a passive role with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission destination." Independent claims 10, 14, and 20 have a similar recitation.

The Examiner contends this feature is taught by Materna citing the discussion beginning on col. 9, line 22. (Action at pages 4-5).

Applicants submit that the Examiner is incorrect in his interpretation of Materna. Even assuming *arguendo* the "SEND command" and the "distribution module may continue performing other functions," discussed by Materna and cited by the Examiner, respectively teach a "role object as an active role and a "role object as a passive role, Applicants submit that nothing in Materna teaches the *arguendo* "role object as an active role" is generating "with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission origin" and nothing in Materna teaches the *arguendo* "role object as a passive role" is generated "with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission destination."

By contrast, Materna teaches, for example, col. 9, lines 27-33):

> Depending on the actual communications protocol employed to communicate over the network 12, each SEND, RECEIVE or AUDIT command may have to be preceded by a CONNECT command to establish communication between the data translator 22 and the update manager 32 of a desired host computer system 10).

Communication method is selected from a plurality of kinds of communication methods is not taught by Materna

Dependent claim 22 recites a storage "wherein the communication method is selected from a plurality of kinds of communication methods including real communication, delayed batch communication, and batch communication."

The Examiner contends this feature is taught by Materna since:

> Materna teaches the communication is selected from, among other things, batch communication (e.g., transmitted as a batch) [see the discussion, beginning at col. 9, line 22].

(Action at page 6).

Applicants submit that the Examiner is incorrect in his interpretation of Materna.

Applicants submit that Materna does not teach a sections "from a plurality of kinds of communication methods." Rather, Materna just teaches that information is transmitted as a batch. That is, a singular method.

Summary

Since features recited by independent claims 4, 10, 14, and 20 (and respective dependent claims 6, 16, and 21-22) are not taught by Materna, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 4, 6, 10, 14, 16, and 20-22 allowed.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _March 30, 2007_   By: _____

Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

9